Opponent's Report on B.A. thesis by Mr. Peter L’uba

**PRAGMATIC METHOD, TRANSFORMATION, PERSPECTIVISM, AND INDIVIDUALISM: THE CORNERSTONE OF PRAGMATISM LAID BY RALPH WALDO EMERSON**

In his B.A. thesis, Mr. Peter L’uba assesses “the sources and correspondences between the philosophical work of Ralph Waldo Emerson and [the] philosophy of pragmatism” (2). The problem area of the foregoing candidate elucidates with the aid of such scholars as Richard Bernstein, John Dewey, Sidney Hook, Williams James, Richard Poirier, David Robbins and Richard Rorty.

The thesis document has sixty-nine pages across six general units and two additional subunits, which include “1. INTRODUCTION: RALPH WALDO EMERSON AND PRAGMATISM, 2. PRAGMATIC METHOD: EMERSON’S ACTION-STYLE PHILOSOPHY 3. FUTURE AND FUGACITY 3.1 EMERSON’S ORIENTATION TOWARDS THE FUTURE 3.2 FUGACITY 4. EMERSON’S PERSPECTIVISM, CREATIVE METAPHORS AND IMAGINATION 5. PRAGMATIC INDIVIDUALISM 6. CONCLUSION: RALPH WALDO EMERSON AND PRAGMATISM”. There is also a very modest one and a quarter page Bibliography. All in all, the thesis is well structured and organized and clear in its presentation as the titles of the individual units of composition suggest. Stylistically the thesis is well written, although there is the odd error such as a missing article for example where “philosophy of pragmatism” should be “the philosophy of pragmatism” (2) or “Conclusion will offer” should read as “the Conclusion will offer” 92) and suchlike instances. Otherwise the piece is very well composed.

All in all, the study is also well argued. Defining the word “fugacity” earlier than page 28 where Mr. L’uba does so would have helped this reader, given reference is made to the term earlier in the thesis. An interesting point for this reader surfaces when the candidate cites Robbins on J.G. Fichte on pp. 34–35, a topic area I would have been glad to have seen amplified a bit more though the candidate does develop a response of his own on page 35. I ask if the candidate could amplify this connection to Fichte?

In another aspect, the candidate makes the claim, “This approach of combined reverence for individual originality and social functioning can be seen as the connecting tissue between Emerson’s seeming indignation with [the] “masses”, and his reverence for each individual; as well as with the approaches of later pragmatists that included the societal aspect of life into the pragmatic method of thinking” (64–65). On page 67 Mr. L’uba valorizes the idea of active engagement and work on the reader’s part to co-create meanings for the Emerson-text. This is all fine and well, but could the candidate clarify more exactly what he means by that in giving a concrete example of this textual feature?
Overall, I recommend the pre thesis defense mark of 1 (výborně) for this thesis work.
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